

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 55-61 remain in the application. Claims 55 and 59 have been amended.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claim 55 has been rejected as being fully anticipated by Bougamont et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,992) (hereinafter "Bougamont") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 11, line 30 to page 12, line 5 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 55 calls for, *inter alia*:

wherein the dosing chamber is formed with two openings and a respective air inlet is disposed upstream of each of the openings, for emptying the dosing chamber from each of the two openings into the suction air channel with respective components of the suction air stream.

On pages 2-3 of the Office action the Examiner alleges that Bougamount discloses "wherein said dosing chamber is formed with two openings and a respective air inlet (12, 13) is disposed upstream of each of said openings."

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation is not accurate. More specifically, while the opening (12) of Bougamount may be upstream of the cavity (3), the opening (13) of Bougamount is downstream of the cavity (3). Therefore, Bougamount does not disclose the dosing chamber is formed with two openings and a respective air inlet is disposed upstream of each of the openings. Accordingly, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation with respect to Bougamount is in error.

The Bougamount reference discloses a cavity (3) with an opening (12) to surrounding air on one side thereof and an opening (13) to the air channel at the opposite side of the

cavity (3). Bougamont does not disclose that both openings of the cavity (3) empty into the air channel.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show wherein the dosing chamber is formed with two openings and a respective air inlet is disposed upstream of each of the openings, for emptying the dosing chamber from each of the two openings into the suction air channel with respective components of the suction air stream, as recited in claim 55 of the instant application. Bougamont discloses that only one opening of the cavity empties into the air chamber. Bougamont does not disclose that both the openings of the cavity empty into the suction air channel. Bougamont does not disclose that a respective air inlet is disposed upstream of each of the openings of the cavity. This is contrary to the present invention as claimed, which recites the dosing chamber is formed with two openings and a respective air inlet is disposed upstream of each of the openings, for emptying the dosing chamber from each of the two openings into the suction air channel with respective components of the suction air stream.

In item 5 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 56-58 have been rejected as being obvious over Bougamont (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,992) in view of Altermatt et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,263,992) (hereinafter "Altermatt") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Altermatt does not make up for the deficiencies of Bougamont.

Since claim 55 is allowable, dependent claims 56-58 are allowable as well.

In item 8 on page 5 of the Office action, claim 61 has been

rejected as being obvious over Bougamont (U.S. Patent No.

5,239,992) in view of Altermatt (U.S. Patent No. 5,263,992)

and further in view of Andersson et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,655,380 B1) (hereinafter "Andersson") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Andersson does not make up for the deficiencies of Bougamont

and Altermatt. Since claim 55 is allowable, dependent claim

61 is allowable as well.

It is appreciatively noted from item 11 on page 6 of the

Office action that claims 59 and 60 would be allowable if

rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations

of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable claim 59 has been amended to include the subject

matter of independent claim 55. Therefore, claim 59 is

allowable. Since claim 59 is allowable, dependent claim 60 is

allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 55. Claim 55 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 55, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 55-58 and 61 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

RIE-24157 - Application No. 10/526,241  
Response to Office action December 9, 2008  
Response submitted March 9, 2009

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect  
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner  
Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler  
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:sa

March 9, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101